

### **REMARKS**

Claim 6 was objected to for incorrect dependency. The abstract was objected to for being overly lengthy. Claims 1–6 were pending and were rejected. Corrections and amendments have been made in the present Office Action. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the forgoing amendments foregoing amendments following remarks.

#### **Objection to Claim 6**

Claim 6 was objected to due to incorrect dependency upon itself. Applicant amended dependent claim 6 to reflect its dependency on independent claim 5.

#### **Objection to the Abstract**

The abstract was objected to for being lengthy. Applicant has made amendments to provide a more concise narrative in compliance with the rule set forth in M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b).

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or implicitly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (see M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Examiner rejected claims 1–2, 3–4, 5–6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura (U.S. Patent 5,539,811). Because the amended claims 1–6 contain at least one limitation neither taught nor suggested by Nakamura, this rejection is improper as to the newly amended claims.

Specifically, the Examiner rejected independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 2 as follows:

*Regarding claim 1, Nakamura discloses a method for processing incoming calls according to H.221 protocol (col.4 ln.7-11) comprising: assigning a terminal address to an endpoint using terminal indicate assignment message in a first channel (reads on interchange of telephone numbers required to set up plural isdn channels between audio and video terminals: col.5 ln.39-54), sending from the endpoint the address in a second channel (col.6 ln.20-53).*

*Regarding claims 2, 4, 6, Nakamura further teaches the following: sending the address is accomplished through the use of a terminal address channel X message (reads on sending BAS code, col.5, lines 55-60), analyzer (reads on 15, fig.1) interprets a terminal indicate additional channel X message from the end point (col.6 lines 20-53).*

Independent claim 1 recites a method of processing simultaneous incoming digital calls using H.221 protocol. The method includes the steps of (1) assigning a terminal address with a multipoint control unit (MCU) to an endpoint terminal using a terminal indicate assignment (TIA) message in a first channel; and (2) receiving from said endpoint terminal the terminal address in a second channel.

Nakamura does not teach a multipoint control unit (MCU). In fact, Nakamura is drawn to a point to point visual communication terminal apparatus whose purpose is to establish a single call from a same calling party on a plurality of channels in a two-party communication. *See Nakamura, col. 7, ll. 50-55.*

Being a conventional point-to-point communication apparatus without a MCU, Nakamura fails to teach or suggest a method of processing simultaneous incoming digital calls including the step of “assigning a terminal address with a multipoint control unit (MCU) to an endpoint terminal using a terminal indicate assignment (TIA) message,” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the Nakamura fails to teach or suggest the step of “receiving from said endpoint terminal the terminal address in a second channel.” The reason is twofold. First, in the absence of a MCU, there would be no assignment of a terminal address to the endpoint terminal. Second, Nakamura clearly states that, the exchange of telephone numbers between the calling and the called parties is done solely through a first channel. *See Nakamura, col. 2 ll. 51-53.* Thus, Nakamura further fails to teach or suggest the limitations recited in claim 1.

Claim 2 requires the endpoint terminal that receives a “TIA message (which contains an assigned terminal address by the MCU) in a first channel” to send back the terminal address “through the use of a terminal indicate additional channel X (TIX) message” in a second channel.

The bit-rate allocation signal (BAS) that Nakamura teaches to encode and exchange telephone number information between the point-to-point call parties is sent through the first established channel. *See id.*, col. 2 ll. 51-53 and col. 5 ll. 39-49. While Nakamura does mention a message being sent through a second channel by the calling party, careful examination of Nakamura will show that the message is not a TIX message as recited in claim 2. *See id.*, col. 2,

II. 54-62. Therefore, Examiner's rejection to dependent claim 2, as well as claims 4 and 6, is improper.

For at least the reasons provided above, Nakamura fails to teach or suggest the limitations recited by claims 1 or 2. Allowance of claims 1 and 2 is therefore respectfully requested.

For independent claim 3, the Examiner states:

*regarding claim 3, Nakamura discloses a processor based videoconferencing station (Fig.1) comprising a medium for storing instructions for causing the processor to: assign a terminal address to an endpoint using terminal assignment message in a first channel (reads on interchanging of telephone numbers required to set up plural ISDN channels between audio and video terminals: col.5 lines 39-54), receive from the endpoint the address in a second channel (col.6 lines 20-53).*

Applicants traverse this rejection of claim 3 for the same reasons provided in the discussion of claim 1. Specifically, because Nakamura does not teach a multipoint control unit, it fails to teach a videoconferencing station comprising "a multipoint control unit (MCU) and a machine readable medium storing instructions" for causing the processor to "assign a terminal address to an endpoint terminal using a terminal indicate assignment (TIA) message in a first channel." Furthermore, because Nakamura's device determines connection capabilities and exchange telephone number information solely in the first established channel, it fails to teach or suggest a processor that "receives from said endpoint terminal the terminal address in a second channel." *See id.*, col. 2, ll. 51-53.

Similarly, the rejection of dependent claim 4 is improper for the same reason set forth above with respect to claim 2. Specifically, Nakamura fails to teach the sending of the terminal address "from the endpoint terminal through the use of a TIX message in a second channel."

For reasons provided above, rejections to claims 3 and 4 are improper. Applicant thus respectfully request Examiner's reconsideration and allowance to claims 3 and 4.

For independent claim 5, the examiner states:

*regarding claim 5, Nakamura discloses a processor based videoconferencing station comprising: a receiver (17, fig.1) for receiving incoming calls according to the H.221 protocol (col.4 lines 7-11), a terminal address assignor (reads on 13, fig.1), a terminal address provided by terminal address assignor (reads on interchange of*

*telephone numbers required to set up plural isdn channels between audio and video terminals: col.5 lines 39-54), an analyzer (reads on 15, fig.1) to determine if the provided terminal address is sent from the end point (col.6 lines 20-53).*

Because Nakamura discloses neither a multipoint control unit nor the sending of terminal address “from the endpoint terminal in a second channel,” rejection to claim 5 is improper for the same reasons provided in the above discussion.

Similarly, rejection of dependent claim 6 is improper for the same reason set forth above with respect to claims 2 and 4, as Nakamura fails to teach the sending of a “TIX message” “from the endpoint terminal in a second channel.”

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, applicant respectfully request Examiner’s reconsideration and allowance to claims 5 and 6.

New claims 7-12 contain limitations similar to those discussed above neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art. Applicants therefore respectfully request their allowance as well.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are allowable, and requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued for these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Billy C. Allen III/  
Billy C. Allen III, Reg. No. 46,147

**CUSTOMER NO. 29855**

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P..  
20333 State Hwy 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070

832/446-2400  
832/446-2424 (facsimile)  
832/446-2409 (direct)